

8 DEC 1959

Suggestions on Project 34.1930

P. 11

I think that what Ch/E says here is that after you define casting as a semifinishing and machining as a finishing process, you then refer to the use of machine tools for rough finishing of castings. If so, this implies that machining can also be a semifinishing operation. You define casting as a semifinishing process on p. 6, but strictly speaking do not define semifinishing as such.

P. 13, Metric tons

You are covered hereby the note on p. 1.

Pp. 13-14

A good place to add a statement on the US position with respect to the use of castings versus forgings and stampings.

P. 14a

Perhaps change bar chart to a line graph and include US data from Table 5 to show comparative trends. Submit draft copy with project to facilitate evaluation.

Pp. 15-17

If the USSR shifts to specialized foundries where will she meet casting needs for short runs of custom items? What is the impact, if any, of the proposed reorganization of the structure of the foundries on the nature of the required castings mix?

P. 17

Compare 2,800 foundries in 1958 with Table 2, p. 23.

P. 25, top

Does not much of the output of the smaller foundries necessarily consist of custom items and short runs for specialized machinery? Are these products amenable to mass or series production? Where will they be produced under future Soviet plans?

P. 26, Shell mold casting

Defined above, p. 7, but could be footnoted here in more detail. Add a short glossary of terms to appendix.

SECRET

P. 29

Likewise define lost wax process briefly for the lay reader.

P. 31, 1st full para, last sent.

Compare with last para, p. 27, which states that USSR has kept up with the US in sand molding technology. Does this mean that the USSR has the know-how but does not apply it widely.

P. 31, last para.

Is information available on the percent of mechanization of molding operations in the US?

Pp. 33-34

It would tighten up this section if the discussion of block molding and weld-casting were moved back to Section IV, A, and discussed along with technology.

P. 37, end long para.

Prevailing where? USSR or US?

P. 38

Reconcile with P. 44 as suggested by D/Ch/E.

Pp. 42-44

Would read better if known production were given first, even though our knowledge is limited to two years. Pare down the statement about poorly developed technology, since this has been developed earlier in the paper.

P. 47, B, first para.

First two sentences also look contradictory to me.

Pp. 47-50

Reverse order. Use a short lead into the two subsections and make a brief conclusion out of the present introduction. The long introductory evaluation makes the discussion seem repetitive.

P. 50, second full para, first sent.

Won't much of the new equipment be absorbed into the modernization program?

SECRET

~~SECRET~~

P. 50, last para.

Redraft conclusion from p. 47, as suggested above.

General Comments:

It seems to me that the substantive problems center around the following questions:

1. Comparative attitude (technological and economic) of the two countries towards ferrous casting versus other processes.
2. Comparison of the structure of the foundry industry in the two countries.
3. Clarification of Soviet intentions toward fulfillment of present plan.
4. Clarification of nature of foundry bottleneck and development of a consistent position on this subject.

25X1A9a

[REDACTED]

~~SECRET~~